DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 619 TM 006 240

AUTHOR Nowakowski, Alan
TITLE Role of Coursework in Evaluation Training.
PUB DATE [Apr 77]
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (61st, New York, New York, April 4-8, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Course Content; *Educational Programs; *Evaluation; Field Experience Programs; Graduate Students; *Graduate Study; Higher Education

ABSTRACT

A student's perspective of graduate level training in evaluation is presented. The primary focus is on the training of evaluators. A secondary focus is on the training of users of evaluation. The position presented in this paper is that (1) evaluation is a higher order skill comprised of many individual skills and skill sets or processes, (2) the role of coursework is in providing conceptual schemata for organizing these skill sets and for developing individual skills and processes, and (3) the role of field-based evaluation training is primarily for testing and expanding conceptual schemata to effectively integrate the many skills and processes involved in doing evaluation. (Author/RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ALAN NOWAKOWSKI

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

ED138619

ROLE OF COURSEWORK IN EVALUATION TRAINING*

Alan Nowakowski
Western Michigan University

When I was first asked if I would care to participate in this proposed symposium, without knowing more than the general topic, my immediate reaction was positive. I thought certainly I should have something to say about evaluation training, especially if a criterion for expertise was length of time spent in the training process. My advisor, Dan Stufflebeam, can (and frequently does) testify to the longevity of my training experience. However, before committing myself (and perhaps this is an indicator of my "trained" evaluation reflexes), I began asking some focusing questions, such as: Generally, what kind of training is the evaluation student presently receiving? What unique perspectives can this student bring to the subject of evaluation training? Who should be involved in evaluation training?

Since the study of formal evaluation is a relatively new field in academia, today's student of evaluation, I feel, has a particularly relevant and valuable perspective to offer. Unlike his predecessors in this field, he should have had the opportunity to learn not only from evaluation experiences, but also from the composite of methodology, coursework and directed training which can be (though it admittedly sometimes is not) the organized and thoughtful product of those who of necessity learned evaluation skills solely by "doing." Certainly, evaluation skills can be acquired through "apprenticeship", but instruction and literature from experienced evaluators can now bring a more broadly based knowledge and necessary specific skills

TM006 240

---

*A presentation in a symposium, From the Other End of the Log: Student Perceptions of Evaluation Training, Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April 5-8, 1977.

to the prospective evaluator in a shorter period of time. This is happening, however, only when careful and systematic planning has provided students with the coursework and training experiences necessary for a competent evaluator. Regardless of whether a student is the product of a rich evaluation training program or one which has a meager selection of courses and experiences, his perspective can add to the challenging process of improving evaluation training.

In giving the "student's perspective" of evaluation training programs, I felt I should have a fair idea about what kinds of experiences evaluation students in general were having in order to make comments relevant to their concerns, as well as my own. A review of a survey of over one hundred colleges and universities by members of the Evaluation Network regarding evaluation training programs, helped give me a better idea of just what kind of educational experiences the evaluation student might be getting, and, more to the point, what he might not be getting. First, only a few colleges indicated that they did not have what could be considered a formal evaluation training program. Secondly, most indicated that either their program was composed of research methods, statistics, and measurement, or simply that they had courses of study related to evaluation training--noting research, statistics and measurement. Finally, only a relatively few colleges had both coursework directed at developing the concept of evaluation and field learning experiences listed as part of their evaluation training program.[1]

Speaking, then, from the standpoint of someone who has had a relatively well-planned and experientially rich training program, and considering fellow students who, given my survey review, I feel, may not be having

---

[1]William J. Gephart and W. James Potter, Evaluation Training Catalog: Training Programs, Phi Delta Kappa, Bloomington, Indiana, May, 1976.

similar training programs, I offer the following propositions: (1) evaluation is a higher order skill comprised of many individual skills and skill sets or processes; (2) the role of coursework in evaluation training is in developing and building a conceptual structure for organizing these skill sets and for developing individual skills and processes, and (3) the role of field learning experiences in evaluation training is to test and expand the conceptual structure by which skills and processes are related for doing evaluation.

It would seem that only a few colleges are utilizing both courses and field experiences to develop what I am calling the concept of evaluation. Little can be said about the quality or relationship between the two experiences from the survey, but the survey suggests that most colleges have not gone beyond providing training in specific skill areas, notably research, statistics and measurement, in providing evaluation training.

My own perspective is that a quality evaluation training program will utilize both course and field experiences to develop a students' concept of evaluation, which should be, I think, the aim of any evaluation training program. By concept of evaluation I am not simply referring to a definition of evaluation, nor to the internal and informal processes by which people make judgments of worth regarding their own daily personal activities. Rather, I am referring to the idea of a total conceptual structure, or network of concepts involved in conducting credible, useful (the best of what has been achieved so far) formal evaluations. It is the internal cognitive system by which formal evaluations are designed and conducted, relating concepts and processes of purpose, roles, standards, data collection, measurement, use, politics, sociological and psychological

effects, ethics, etc. It is, finally, the internal structure and organization by which an individual functions in a formal way as an evaluator. Besides having organization and structure it is also an evolving system that changes over time as experiences calls it into play.

How does one begin to build such a Gestalt? First, a general course should be designed for the purpose of providing the student with a broad superordinate structure of what is involved in the totality of the formal evaluation process. I am not suggesting that a student can acquire, through one course, a total functioning conceptual system for effectively doing formal evaluation. However, a major part of the first stages of building such a system is the acquisition of knowledge with respect to what is involved. Formal coursework is an effective vehicle for developing a conceptual superstructure of the overall process. There is little doubt, that at best, the structure will be loose and a bit shaky, but it will save the student the considerable time and effort required to arrive at a similar position through experience.

This superstructure should also provide the basis for selecting courses aimed at developing skills or skill sets to strengthen particular parts of the total system. Acquiring early in training a broad conceptual structure of what is involved in the total evaluation process provides the student with necessary direction for developing particular skills which are important parts of the evaluation process.

It seems both appropriate and important to note at this point that no training program is effective unless it takes into consideration the individual needs and strengths of students. Coursework aimed at developing specific skills useful in the evaluation process must be inclusive of an

array of skills--any one students' background, interests and strengths, however, will determine which particular set of skills are applicable and necessary in his training program. I believe there is a need to experiment with many different perspectives and skill sets in conducting formal evaluation. Trainees should be given considerable flexibility in exploring different avenues and developing particular skills they believe important to building their concept of evaluation. Coursework relevant to improved skills in the evaluation process include courses in past and current evaluation methodology, statistics, research, measurement, administration, financing, and communication. In addition, evaluation training programs should use courses offered in any department when skills they offer seem generally relevant to the field and specifically relevant and necessary to the individual student. Such coursework might include demography, data processing, psychology, learning theory, group procedures, sociology, speech, writing (composition), etc. Through such coursework, the evaluation student should acquire a firm knowledge regarding the concept of evaluation as well as specific skills to facilitate the formal evaluation process.

After coursework has served to develop an initial overriding structure regarding the concept of evaluation, and is aiding in the development of skills to be used in the process of evaluation, field learning experiences should be provided. I believe the role of field internship experiences is to test the developing structure, add to it, reorganize, and integrate the skills involved, and, ultimately, to develop confidence in the art and science of evaluating. This, I feel, can only be achieved through involvement in actual evaluation work. One cannot develop a working functional structure

without providing experiential settings within which it can function. Each application is a learning experience demanding adjustments or changes be made in the system to accommodate problems encountered . . . and there is no shortage of problems in any evaluation experience.

If one accepts that course-based skills develop through experience, an important point to keep in mind in providing internship training experience is that the student needs to be involved in the total evaluation process. Repeated internships involving only some parts of the process will strengthen the skills involved in those parts of the process, but they will not provide the student with the totality necessary to do evaluation effectively.

Having focused to this point on the training of evaluators, I would like now to discuss the role of coursework and training in evaluation for those students pursuing professions which are intimately involved in the process and thus, ultimate success of evaluation.

An area of evaluation training which is rarely addressed, one which may be critical to the survival of evaluation as a profession, and one which may have the best potential of upgrading the quality of evaluation work, is the training of those who use or are affected by evaluations. It has been frequently postulated that there needs to be a synergistic relationship between the evaluator and decision makers. In fact, there needs to be an understanding of what evaluation is about on the part of all those involved in the process. This rarely happens, and I do not see how it can happen without those involved with evaluation, e.g., administrators, developers, teachers, evaluators, etc., having a shared concept of evaluation. Their individual concepts will always differ to some extent,

especially with respect to some of the skills involved in the process, but it seems to me that there needs to be considerable overlap in their general conceptual framework of what evaluation entails in order for evaluation to be done effectively. In many situations I have observed, very little shared understanding exists regarding evaluation among those involved in the process. I have frequently witnessed discussions in which different role groups seem to be talking past each other, having almost no understanding of what the other is saying. With little shared understanding of what evaluation entails it is no wonder that evaluators are not getting the resources and support they need, nor are decision groups getting useful information. I think there is little chance of this cooperation until all those involved have an understanding of what evaluation is and what it can do for you . . . or to you.

There is a real need to provide systematic training to the various role groups for two reasons; first, because they need a conceptual basis for making responsible decisions regarding the use of evaluation; second, because I believe formal evaluation rests on shared responsibility. Without an understanding of what is involved in the process, there is little chance of the responsibilities being effectively met.[2]

Training aimed at the administrator, counselor, teacher, etc., should first and primarily develop their respective concepts of evaluation. This can be achieved (or at least begun) by an introductory course dealing with

---

[2] Illustrative examples, in the form of pitfalls, of some of the responsibilities I perceive users have or share with evaluators in the evaluation process, particularly those who contract for evaluation work, is appended.

the history and methology of evaluation.[3] Additional coursework might be aimed at focusing on evaluation as it interacts specifically within a particular role or function (e.g., the principal's role in evaluation). The relationship between coursework (however limited it might initially be) and field experience should again be linked. Both evaluators and decision makers need to develop similar general frameworks regarding what is involved in the evaluation process. Both need to test this framework and evolve it into a functional working system for their respective roles in the evaluation process through real world experiences. The major practical difference in training the various role groups involved in evaluation and evaluators is with respect to the many technical tasks evaluators are responsible for performing in the evaluation process. Though such groups such as administrators and teachers need not be highly skilled in these technical tasks, they cannot afford to be unaware of them. To the degree that a client is ignorant of technical aspects of evaluation he will either be suspicious of the entire process or fail to recognize its important shortcomings. General introductory courses in research, statistics, and measurement aimed at the evaluation consumer can help bridge the gap between the evaluator and his potential clients. Having said this, I want to make it clear that I am not suggesting that the training programs of role groups involved with evaluation be structured solely in terms of their interface role with evaluation. I am only suggesting that provisions be made in their training for providing them with a concept of

---

[3] As I speak of introductory courses in evaluation, I have in mind the Theory of Evaluation course offered at Western Michigan University by Stufflebeam. Since it is probably more inclusive than many such courses with similar titles, I offer a syllabus of its contents to illustrate a rather comprehensive introduction to the concept of evaluation.

evaluation useful for the responsibilities they will be expected to meet.

In summary, it has been by contention that many evaluation students are not receiving the benefit of courses and skills that should and could be made accessible to them today. I have proposed that evaluation is a higher order skill comprised of many underlying and supporting skills which can be introduced in the classroom but must be developed in the field. Further, I have urged that training in evaluation should not be relegated solely to the prospective evaluator. In order to significantly improve the process, consumers need to become knowledgeable regarding its promises and its limitations, and acquire the skills necessary to meet their responsibilities in the evaluation process. The necessary consequences of improved training programs for both these groups, I feel, is enlightened and improved educational evaluation.

Nowakowski
WMU Evaluation Center
October, 1976

Client/Consumer Evaluation Pitfall List*

Evaluation is a joint responsibility. Too often this has been overlooked and evaluators have been given primary responsibility for producing effective evaluation. The results in general have been anything but satisfactory.

This situation is likely to persist as long as others, especially those for which the evaluation is undertaken, are unaware of or fail to respond effectively to their role in the evaluation process.

The client's role is critical in the evaluation process. As an analogy, imagine an individual contracting a builder and simply saying, build me a house. Is there any doubt (skills aside) as to how well the house the builder designs and builds on his own is likely to suit the individual's needs?

Evaluation is a considerably more complex process than building a house. The client has major responsibilities with respect to determining what he needs and wants and creating conditions for this to occur within a sociopolitical context. How well this is done greatly affects the quality of the evaluation process.

Following is a list of pitfalls for clients to consider and protect against to meet their responsibilities in the evaluation process.

---

*Items in this list were developed in consideration of An Administrative Checklist for Reviewing Evaluation Plans (Stufflebeam, AERA, 1974, "Toward a Technology for Evaluating Evaluation") and Evaluator Pitfalls (Stufflebeam, working document, September, 1976).

Client Pitfalls

A. Conceptual

1. Background --failing to acquire knowledge of the area of evaluation to obtain understanding of what evaluation can do for you or to you
2. Definition --failing to have a clear and suitable definition of evaluation or unawareness of definitional conflicts with or among others involved
3. Audiences --failing to identify and consider the different groups who will need evaluation information; failing to specify clearly the audience(s) for the evaluation effort
4. Object --failing to define clearly the object of the evaluation or setting inappropriate boundaries for the evaluation
5. Purpose --having an unclear, restricted, or unrealistic view of what purposes evaluation might serve; failing to clarify the specific purpose(s) of an evaluation effort
6. Information base --failing to utilize the existing information base to determine what additional information is required to serve evaluation purposes; having a dim or narrow view of the range of information which should be obtained and considered for a fair evaluation to take place
7. Questions --failing to develop a comprehensive list of important questions to be answered; failing to obtain input from the target audiences for identifying important questions
8. Process and outcomes --failing to give advance consideration to possible process effects and alternative potential findings
9. Role participation --viewing too narrowly or vaguely the persons who must cooperate
10. Standards for object assessment --viewing too narrowly or vaguely the standards to be used for evaluating the object
11. Standards for assessing the evaluation --viewing too narrowly or vaguely the standards for assessing the quality of the evaluation

B. Administrative

1. Resource allocation--failing to provide sufficient resources to make effective evaluation possible
2. Evaluator role definition --failing to suitably define and clarify the evaluator's role, tasks, and responsibilities
3. Evaluator selection--failing to carefully investigate individuals' qualifications for the role or viewing too narrowly or vaguely the qualifications required
4. Facilities --failing to allocate sufficient space and equipment
5. Point of entry --failing to consider the costs and benefits of starting the the evaluation at different points in time; moreoften, starting the evaluation too late, thereby making important decisions without the benefit of evaluation, restricting or greatly increasing the costs of decision courses at later points in time

6.	Time schedule	--failing to provide sufficient time for effective evaluation to be possible; failing to coordinate the evaluation schedule with participants' time schedules and with the decision making process
7.	Design assessment	--failing to assess the evaluation design for potential implementation problems and the expected quality and utility of the information to be produced in terms of costs and information needs
8.	Monitoring implementation	--failing to monitor the evaluation process to insure that the design is being effectively implemented and/or appropriately adjusted in response to problems encountered
9.	Product assessment	--neglecting to provide for a careful evaluation of the products of the evaluation study

C. Sociopolitical

1.	Evaluator preparation	--failing to inform the evaluator of antecedents to the evaluation, protocol to be followed, areas of concern or anxiety with respect to the evaluation, and forces likely to affect the conduct and use of evaluation
2.	Audience and participant instruction	--failing to clarify one's definition of evaluation, purposes for doing the evaluation, how it will be or was conducted, and factors to consider regarding use of the evaluation results
3.	Audience involvement	--failing to involve the target audiences in the planning and implementation of the evaluation study
4.	Credibility	--failing to structure the evaluation so that it will be viewed as objective and fair by the target audiences
5.	Communication	--failing to communicate frequently with evaluators, staff, and audiences regarding the evaluation
6.	Participant cooperation	--failing to work with the evaluator to secure cooperation from participants in the study
7.	Responsiveness	--failing to be responsive to problems the evaluator is encountering or participants are encountering due to the evaluation
8.	Values	--failing to clarify standards for assessing the object of evaluation and to provide justification of these standards
9.	Value dissonance	--neglecting value conflicts among target audiences and failing to help negotiate differences
10.	Political manipulation	--allowing one or more interest groups at the exclusion of others to dominate or control the evaluation process; failing to anticipate in advance audience reactions to the evaluation

D. Contractual/Legal

1.	Commitment	--agreeing to support the evaluation process before knowing how it will be conducted
2.	Products	--failing to specify the evaluation products
3.	Time	--failing to agree on a realistic schedule
4.	Finance	--failing to agree about financial constraints and a realistic budget

5.	Facilities-	--failing to provide the needed space and equipment
6.	Role responsibilities	--failing to agree about who will perform what tasks in the evaluation process
7.	Protocol	--failing to agree on what communication channels will be used and what existing policies and rules will be observed
8.	Access to data	--failing to agree on what existing data may be used and what new data may be obtained
9.	Security	--failing to agree about how to keep the data base secure from unauthorized use
10.	Informed consent	--failing to inform and secure permission from those who are expected to supply personalized data
11.	Arrangements	--failing to agree on what special conditions are required to meet sampling and treatment assumptions
12.	Editing	--failing to determine final editorial authority
13.	Release of reports	--failing to agree about who may release the evaluation reports and who will receive them
14.	Conflict arbitration	--failing to agree on how to deal with conflicts or problems encountered
15.	Flexibility	--negotiating an inflexible contract
16.	Spin-off	--failing to agree on how the evaluation can be used to train evaluators, do research on evaluation, and aid the client system to institutionalize evaluation
17.	Termination	--failing to agree on conditions for terminating the contract

E. Utility

1.	Critical issues	--failing to identify or having a too restricted view of the issues, factors, concerns which should be considered in making value judgments regarding the object of evaluation
2.	Issues not addressed	--failing to identify and consider the importance and implication of important issues which the evaluation has not addressed
3.	Understanding of findings	--neglecting difficulties encountered in grasping the meaning of reported results or failing to cross-check one's interpretation with others to identify possible deficiencies in interpretations
4.	Report development	--failing to participate during the report development stage as a reactor and evaluator of procedures and materials developed by the evaluator for reporting findings to target audiences
5.	Targeted reporting	--failure to provide for reporting which addresses each audience's information needs in a form they can readily understand
6.	Media	--failure to provide for use of appropriate media in reporting results
7.	Editing	--failing to insure that careful editing has been done for accuracy, clarity, legality, and confidentiality requirements
8.	Sources of bias	--failing to assess findings for possible sources of bias affecting the collection and provision of evaluation information and recommendations

9.	Limitations	--failing to identify and take into account limitations of the study
10.	Audit	--failing to obtain external assessments of strengths and weaknesses of the study
11.	Application	--failing to translate evaluation reports into practice
12.	Regimented or dictated use	--applying findings in a regimented or dictatorial fashion without carefully assessing potential consequences and reactions
13.	Bias or insensitivity	--outright rejection of evaluation findings solely because the findings conflict with anticipated or expected results
14.	Filtering	--failing to select information from evaluation reports which merit consideration despite identified weaknesses in the study
15.	Transfer	--failing to consider situational differences in applying results of evaluation studies
16.	Follow-up	--failing to establish procedures which support the use of evaluation findings
17.	Counteraction	--failing to respond to actions which jeopardize the conduct or use of evaluation
18.	Cost/effectiveness	--expending more money on an evaluation than it is worth
19.	Use of data	--hindering efforts to exploit the full potentiality of the data
20.	Control of data	--releasing data to persons who are not qualified to analyze it
21.	Learning	--failing to study the evaluation process to determine ways in which it may be improved

F. Moral/Ethical

1.	Avoidance	--failing to plan and responsibly incorporate evaluation in the decision process
2.	Pretext	--stating falsely the intended use of the evaluation results or claiming evaluation results as the basis for decisions made due to other factors
3.	Inadequate resources	--providing insufficient resources for effective evaluation to take place
4.	Misrepresentation/ misuse	--misinterpretating, distorting, withholding or delaying evaluation information for audience use; failing to discourage and counteract others from doing so.
5.	Obstacles	--creating obstacles or placing undue contraints on the evaluation; failing to discourage and counteract others from doing so
6.	Involvement	--failing to involve those affected by the evaluation
7.	Dissemination	--failing to provide for groups having a legitimate concern in the evaluation and making the results available to them
8.	Representation	--failing to provide for representation of value perspectives of legitimate reference groups involved and/or affected by the evaluation
9.	Comparisons	--failing to compare the object of an evaluation with its critical competitors
10.	Equality	--fueling discriminatory efforts
11.	Social value	--failing to relate evaluations to human needs.

P R O S P E C T U S

January, 1973

Education 663
THEORIES OF EVALUATION

Dept. of Educational Leadership
College of Education
Western Michigan University

Location and Time

Room 3101 Sangren Hall
Tuesday 1:00 - 4:00 P.M.

Office Hours: Tuesday 4:00 - 5:00

Instructor

Daniel L. Stufflebeam
Room 3106
Sangren Hall
383-1994

Overview of the Course

This course will focus on evaluation theory. Through readings, discussions, and use of selected audio-visual materials, students will be assisted to develop an understanding of alternative theoretical positions on evaluation. Particularly the ideas of Ralph Tyler, Robert Hammond, Malcolm Provus, Robert Stake, Michael Scirven, and Daniel Stufflebeam will be studied. Also, teams of students will do original theoretical work in evaluation. They will identify, analyze, and propose inquiry strategies for special problem topics in evaluation. Such topics may include socio-political, contractual-legal, technical, administrative, training and moral-ethical problems in evaluation. In summary, students in this course will learn and analyze past evaluation theoretical contributions and will work creatively to develop new and better ways of doing evaluation work.

There are no hard and fast prerequisites for students in this course. However, students in the course must have both the interests and capacity to analyze, critique and develop theoretical ideas about evaluation. While the course is not a statistics, measurement or experimental design course, it does assume knowledge of basic concepts in these areas. If students in the course are deficient in these areas, it is assumed such students will overcome their problems on their own.

Student performance in the course will be assessed in a variety of ways. Knowledge of alternative theoretical ideas about evaluation will be assessed through an objective test midway through the course. Ability to speak about evaluation theory will be assessed by having students turn in 10-15 minute cassette tapes on which they present their views on some assigned evaluation topic; also the students' performance in conducting a special class session will be assessed. Ability to write about evaluation theory will be assessed through students'

written reports on their assigned evaluation topic and through essay questions on the final examination. Ability to analyze evaluation theory and make creative suggestions will be assessed through rating their team's performance in planning and conducting a special class session. Ability to do evaluation will be assessed through reviewing test items prepared by the students for their special topical areas. Thus, student success in the course will be determined through assessing and synthesizing a judgment about students' abilities to answer objective questions, write about evaluation, speak about it and do it.

The credit value of the course is 3 semester hours. Fifteen 3-hour sessions will be devoted to the course for a total of 45 contact hours. It is estimated that students will need to spend a minimum of 90 hours, or 6 hours per week, in work outside the class.

The primary readings for the course are:

Blaine R. Worthen and James R. Sanders. Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones, 1973.

Daniel L. Stufflebeam, Walter J. Foley, William Gephart, Egon G. Guba, Robert L. Hammond, Howard O. Merriman, and Malcolm Provus. Educational Evaluation and Decision-Making. Itasca, Illinois: Peacock, 1971.

These will be supplemented with a variety of journal articles, audio tapes, films, and unpublished papers. Copies of all required references will be placed on reserve in the Educational Resource Center in Sangren Hall.

Objectives

1. The student will demonstrate his/her knowledge of alternative theoretical positions in evaluation by passing the mid-term objective test over selected works of R. Tyler, Metfessel and Michael, Atkin, Popham, Krathwohl, Hammond, Provus, Cronbach, Scriven, Stake, the PDK Study Committee and Stufflebeam.

2. The student will demonstrate his/her ability to speak about evaluation theory by obtaining a satisfactory rating of a 10-15 minute cassette tape prepared by the student to address some specified topic, e.g., the meaning of evaluation, uses of evaluation, evaluating teachers, the politics of evaluation, evaluation training or the economics of evaluation. The presentation should be for some particular group, e.g., teachers, parents, researchers or students. The student is to turn in his tape by April 9.

3. The student will demonstrate his/her ability to write about evaluation theory by writing a paper, and obtaining a satisfactory rating of it, about some specified evaluation problem area. The student will do this in conjunction with one or more other students. Their paper will be written in relation to a special evaluation session they will conduct for the class. The papers are to be completed and distributed at least one week prior to the authors' scheduled class sessions.

4. The student will also demonstrate his/her ability to write about evaluation through passing the final "essay" examination over the content covered in the student-conducted sessions.

5. The student will demonstrate his/her ability to analyze evaluation theory through obtaining a satisfactory rating of his/her work in conducting a class session on some specified evaluation topic.

6. The student will demonstrate his/her ability to do evaluation through obtaining a satisfactory rating of evaluation exercises to cover the special topics he or she presented in his/her special session. These exercises are to be turned in no later than April 9.

The instructor will make all the ratings referenced above for each student. In arriving at a final grade he will weight the objectives as follows:

(.50) 1 + (.10) 2 + (.10) 3 + (.15) 4 + (.10) 5 + (.05) 6.

Thus, 50% of the student's grade will depend on his/her knowledge of extant theoretical positions in evaluation, while the other 50% will assess his/her abilities to write, speak and perform in the area of evaluation theory. This apportionment is intended to reflect the course's attempt to have students learn about existing ideas, but go beyond them in developing new ones. It also is intended to provide students with opportunities to demonstrate their achievements through a variety of assessment channels.

Schedule

Jan. 8	Preliminary Evaluation of Student Needs	-- Context Evaluation Instrument -- Self Assessment of Evaluation Skills Instrument -- CIRCE Attitude Toward Evaluation Instrument
	Background for the Course	-- How and why CIPP was developed -- Analysis of Evaluation Problems
	Overview of the Course	-- Objectives -- Organization of Content -- Schedule -- General Assignments -- Individual Assignments -- Library Resources -- Student Evaluation
Jan. 15	Worthen and Sanders	-- General Perspective -- ESEA Impact on Evaluation -- Evaluation as Disciplined Inquiry -- Chart Comparing Alternative Views
	Ralph Tyler	-- Basic Evaluation Paradigm -- Roles of Evaluation
	Metfessel and Michael	-- Neo Tylerian Model -- Evaluative Criteria
	Behavioral Objectives	-- Atkin -- Popham -- Kratlwohl
	Experimental Design	-- Glass
	Course Planning	-- Discussion of Preliminary Evaluation Results -- Discussions regarding Individual Assignments
Jan. 22	Hammond	-- EPIC Model
	Provus	-- Discrepancy Model
	Cronbach	-- Course Improvement through Evaluation
Jan. 29	Scriven	-- The Methodology of Evaluation -- Goal-Free Evaluation

Feb. 5	Scriven	— Pathway Comparison Model — Product Checklist — Modus Operandi Analysis
Feb. 12	Stake	— Countenance Model — Responsive Evaluation — Other
Feb. 19	PDK Study Group	— An Evaluation of Evaluation — Evaluation Defined — Decision Making — Values — Levels — Research Model
Feb. 26	Stufflebeam	— CIPP Model — CIPP Relative to Experimental Design — CIPP Relative to Accountability
Mar. 12	Stufflebeam	— Strategies for Institutionalizing Evaluation — Advocate Team Methodology — Columbus Evaluation Profile — A Generalized Conception of Evaluation
Mar. 19	Evaluation Practitioner	— Application of Evaluation Theory — Assessment of Evaluation Theory
Mar. 26	Mid Term	— All readings — Lectures — Re course objectives
Apr. 2	Student Team #1	— Socio/Political Problems
	Student Team #2	— Contractual/Legal Problems
	Student Team #3	— Technical Problems
Apr. 9	Student Team #4	— Administrative Problems
	Student Team #5	— Moral/Ethical Problems
	Student Team #6	— Training Problems
Apr. 16	NO CLASS	AERA Annual Meeting
Apr. 23	Final Exam	— Make-up for any who failed mid term — Assessment of material from last half of the course

Suggested Schedule of Reading

By	Jan. 15	Worthen-Sanders book: pp. 1-39, pp. 218-279.
	Jan. 22	Worthen-Sanders book: pp. 40-59, pp. 156-209.
	Jan. 29	Worthen-Sanders book: pp. 60-106, Evaluation Comment issue on Goal-Free Evaluation
	Feb. 5	Copies of unpublished works of Scriven to be placed on reserve in the library (Typescripts of Scriven's papers on: Pathway Evaluation, the Product Checklist, and Modus Operandi Analysis).
	Feb. 12	Worthen-Sanders book: pp. 106-127, 303-342, and Stake's paper on Responsive Evaluation, to be placed on reserve in the library.
	Feb. 19	Stufflebeam, et al. book: pp. 1-213.
	Feb. 26	Stufflebeam, et al. book: pp. 214-239; Worthen-Sanders book: pp. 128-156; library reserve copies of Stufflebeam's articles relating CIPP to experimental design and accountability.
	Mar. 12	Library reserve copy of Guba and Stufflebeam's paper on institutionalizing the CIPP Model, library reserve copy of Stufflebeam's proposal on advocate team methodology.
	Mar. 19	Library reserve papers by Jerry Walker.
	Apr. 2	Readings to be assigned by Team #1 on socio/political problems in evaluation, readings to be assigned by Team #2 on contractual/ legal problems in evaluation and readings to be assigned by Team #3 on technical problems in evaluation.
	Apr. 9	Readings to be assigned by Team #4 on administrative problems in evaluation, readings to be assigned by Team #5 on moral/ ethical problems in evaluation, and readings to be assigned by Team #6 on training problems in evaluation.

Reserve Library Materials

Class Prospectus for Educational Leadership 663 Theories of Evaluation. January 1974.

Evaluation Center Prospectus.

Evaluation Comment, The Journal of Educational Evaluation. Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA. Vol. 3, No. 4 (December 1972).

Guba, Egon G. and Daniel L. Stufflebeam. "Strategies for the Institutionalization of the CIPP Evaluation Model." Address delivered at Eleventh Annual PDK Symposium on Educational Research. June 24, 1970.

Merriman, Howard O. The Columbus School Profile. A Report of the Columbus Public Schools to the Community. May 1970.

Reinhard, Diane L. Final Report. Design of a Planning and Assessment System for the Division of Manpower and Institutions. Project No. 1-0857; Contract No. OEG-0-71-4558. August 31, 1971.

Scriven, Michael. Evaluation Perspective and Procedures. AERA Training Package, 1973.

Scriven, Michael, et al. An Evaluation System of Regional Labs and R & D Centers. Advocate Team Report. A Report Presented to the Division of Research and Development Resources. National Center for the Educational Research and Development. U. S. Office of Education. Project #1-0857; Grant No. OEG 0-71-4558. August 31, 1971.

Spillane, Robert R. The New Rochelle School Profile II. A Report of the New Rochelle Public Schools to the Community. Spring 1972.

Stake, Robert E. Responsive Evaluation. December 5, 1972.

Stufflebeam, Daniel L., et al. Educational Evaluation and Decision Making. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1971.

_____. "The Use of Experimental Design in Educational Evaluation: Journal of Educational Measurement, Vol. 8, No. 4(Winter 1971), pp. 267-274.

_____. "The Relevance of the CIPP Evaluation Model for Educational Accountability." SRIS Quarterly. Vol. 5, No. 1(Spring 1972), pp. 3-6.

_____. Alternative Approaches to Educational Evaluation. AERA Training Package, 1973.

_____. A Conceptualization of Evaluation. AERA Training Cassette Tapes #2C. 1973.

_____. Design for Evaluating R & D Institutions and Programs. Advocate Team Report. A Report Presented to the Division of Research and Development Resources. National Center for Educational Research and Development. U. S. Office of Education. Project #1-0857; Grant No. OEG 0-71-4558. August 31, 1971.

Stufflebeam, Daniel L., et al. Critique of the Report of the Phi Delta Kappa Study Committee on Evaluation. A Report of a Symposium Conducted During the 1971 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association Division B. New York City. February 6, 1971.

_____, and John A. Hilderbrand. Proposal to Design an Accountability System for the Ohio State Department of Education. May 15, 1972.

Tyler, R. W. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

_____. "General Statement on Evaluation," Journal of Educational Research, 1942, 35, 492-501.

_____. "The Purposes of Assessment," Improving Educational Assessment and an Inventory of Measures of Affective Behavior, edited by Walcott, H. Beatty(Washington, D.C.: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA. 1969), pp. 2-13.

Walker, Jerry P. Installing an Evaluation Capability in an Educational Setting: Barriers and Caveats. Paper presented to 1972 AERA Annual Meeting, September 1972.

_____. AIDE. A Quality Assurance Strategy for Educational R & D. Center for Vocational and Technical Education. Ohio State University. July 1973.

Worthen, Blaine R. and James R. Sanders. Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishers, 1973.

Worthen, Blaine R., et al. Critique of Three Proposed Designs for an Accountability System for the State of Ohio. A Report to the Ohio Accountability Project, The Ohio State University Evaluation Center. November 20, 1972.